

REMARKS

Claims 1-66 are pending after this amendment.

Applicants have amended claims 1, 3-25, 27-42, 44, 46-68 and 70-79 in order to more particularly define the invention. The amendments were not necessitated by the claim rejections.

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC § 102(e)

In the 3rd and 4th paragraphs of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1, 2, 19, 20, 27-32, 35-39, 42-45, 54, 55, 59, 60, 63, 64, 73, and 74 under 35 USC 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Davis et al (US 20020085759 A1). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The claimed invention relates to the manipulation of collections of stored documents based on adhering stickers specifying actions proximate to graphic representations of the stored documents in a document index. Graphic representations of documents and stickers are located by the image reader independently. A sticker specifying an action on a document is determined based on a comparison of the location of the sticker and the location of a graphic representation of a document.

Accordingly, independent claims 1, 42, 43, and 63 have been amended to include elements directed to locating “at least a first graphic representation of a first stored document”. Independent claims 1, 42, 43 and 63 have also been amended to include elements directed to determining a sticker specifying an action to be performed on the document “based on the location of the action sticker with respect to the first graphic representation.”

Independent claim 1 has been specifically amended to recite:

receiving **an image of a document index**;
locating, on the document index image, at least a first **graphic representation of a first stored document**;
locating, on the document index image, an image of a first sticker specifying an action;
determining that the first sticker specifies a first action to be performed on the first stored document **based on a location of the first sticker** with respect to the first graphic representation; and
performing the specified first action to cause a change to the first stored document.

The remaining independent claims 42, 44 and 63 have been similarly amended to recite elements similar to those above for Claim 1.

These features support the determination of a sticker specifying an action on a document based the locations of both a first sticker and a first graphic representation of a document. These features enable the extension of this method to include the determination of a plurality of stickers specifying a plurality of actions on a plurality of documents, thus supporting the manipulation of collections of stored documents. The ability to manipulate collections of different electronically stored documents/files based on adhering stickers on a hardcopy document image provides a level of facility in document manipulation using hard-copy documents not possible or suggested by the art of record.

Davies does not disclose these elements. Davies is directed to a system in which tags are adhered to a single hardcopy document to specify an action or service to be performed on the document.

First, Davies does not disclose “receiving **an image of a document index**”. A document index, as commonly known in the art, is a collection of documents. The Examiner implicitly acknowledges this deficiency in the rejection of this element where the Examiner

states “the action processor reads the bitmap received by from the scanner.” The portion of Davies cited by the Examiner is directed to a generic bitmap containing images of tags, not an **image of a document index**.

In fact, Davies **teaches away** from an image of document index in paragraph [0007] citing that the use of special purpose coversheets such as **an image of a document index** is *“tedious and relatively inefficient, as it requires a special-purpose coversheet to be used to each job. It can be inconvenient to maintain a supply of the proper coversheets”*. In the present invention, images of document indices are continually generated in order to represent the most recent version of the stored documents, not as general purpose forms.

Consequently, Davies does not disclose “locating, on the document index image, at least a first **graphic representation of a first stored document**”. Davies is directed to the manipulation of a single hardcopy document through the use of tags (*see* paragraph [0012]) adhered to the document. In a system such as Davies, in which tags are directly adhered to a single hardcopy document for which they specify actions, there is no need to provide a **graphic representation** of the document. Thus, Davies fails to disclose “locating, on the document index image, at least a first **graphic representation of a first stored document**”.

Further, Davies does not disclose “determining that the first sticker specifies a first action to be performed on the first stored document **based on a location** of the first sticker with respect to the first graphic representation”. Davies discloses a one step system of identifying tags adhered to hard-copy documents for which they specify actions. For the reasons stated above, Davies does not disclose an additional step to determine the documents for which the stickers specify actions. Accordingly, there is no step of “determining that the first sticker specifies a first action to be performed on the first stored document based on a location of the first sticker with respect to the first graphic representation”.

For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that claims 1, 42, 44 and 63 are patentably distinguishable over the cited art. Claims 2, 19, 20, 27-32, 36-39 a. 43-45, 54, 55, 59, 60, 63, 64, 73 and 74 depend from claims 1, 42, 44 and 63, respectively. Additionally, claims 2, 19, 20, 27-32, 36-39, 43-45, 54, 55, 59, 60, 63, 64, 73 and 74 recite features not disclosed by the cited art. Thus, Applicant submit that claims 2, 19, 20, 27-32, 36-39, 43-45, 54, 55, 59, 60, 63, 64, 73 and 74 are patentably distinguishable over the cited art.

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 103(a)

In the 5th and 6th paragraphs of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 3-18, 21-26, 33, 34, 40, 41, 46-53, 56-58, 61, 62, 65-72, and 75-79 under 35 USC 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Davies in view of Cooper et al. (USPN 5,680,223) and Cotte (USPN 5,499,108). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Neither Cooper nor Cotte remedy the deficiencies of Davies. Specifically, neither Cotte nor Cooper disclose features to support the manipulation of collections of stored documents.

Cooper is directed to the manipulation of electronic documents through the use of special purpose cover forms which specify actions such as labeling, retrieving and storing. Cotte is directed to a system in which the software of the input device recognizes special commands to issue to a computer based on pre-defined command symbols and auxiliary symbols contained within a scanned document.

Dependent claims have been amended to recite “**a collection of documents**”, thus clarifying that a collection refers to a plurality of documents or files. This amendment has been made for the purpose of clarification only and does not change the scope of the claimed invention. This amendment is supported in the specification, for example, at [0008].

In his rejection of claim 3, the Examiner construes a collection as being a single data file. The portion of Cooper cited by the Examiner in this rejection states “A file as used herein shall be understood to mean a collection of data” and discusses the manipulation of a single data file. Neither Cotte nor Cooper disclose features to support the manipulation of “**collections of documents**” or in otherwords a plurality of files individually as part of a group or set.

Specifically, both Cotte and Cooper fail to disclose “receiving **an image of a document index**”, an integral feature for the manipulation of stored collections of documents. Cooper does disclose the use of special cover forms with check boxes for marking off documents and special fields for handwritten labels (*see* Cooper FIG. 9. and col. 3 lines 46-50). However, Cooper is directed to the generation of special cover forms containing handwritten labels (document image domains) and checkboxes representing stored documents that are **pre-selected** by the user for manipulation, not of an image of document index. Col. 4, lines 6-12 of Cooper state, “*According to this aspect, a user would request a listing of the labels of an appropriate set of files which are stored on or accessible to the computer. In response to the request for the listing, the computer generates a display of the image domain in file label, if any, and possibly other indications, for each file.*” Cotte is solely directed to the recognition of command symbols and does not disclose an image of a document index. Thus, both Cotte and Cooper fail to disclose “**an image of a document index**”.

Consequently, both Cooper and Cooper fail to disclose “locating, **on the document index** image, an image of a first sticker specifying an action”. As discussed above, neither Cooper nor Cotte disclose a document index image upon which to adhere stickers. Cooper further **teaches away** from the use of stickers to specify actions, instead using special purpose forms for different types of actions to perform upon selected documents represented by their name or image label (*see* FIG. 4, FIG. 9, FIG. 12).

Accordingly, neither Cooper nor Cotte disclose “determining that the first sticker specifies a first action to be performed on the first stored document **based on a location** of the first sticker **with respect to the first graphic representation**”. Cotte does not disclose either a document index or a graphic representation. In Cooper, actions to be performed upon documents are determined from user selection of check boxes (see FIG. 4, FIG. 9, FIG. 12).

Claims 1, 42, 44 and 63 have been shown above to be patentably distinguishable over Davies. Claims 3-18, 21-26, 33, 34, 40, 41, 46-53, 56-58, 61, 62, 65-72, and 75-79 depend from claims 1, 42, 44 and 63. For at least the reasons above, neither Cotte nor Cooper remedy the deficiencies of Davies. Additionally, claims 3-18, 21-26, 33, 34, 40, 41, 46-53, 56-58, 61, 62, 65-72, and 75-79 recite features not disclosed by the cited art. Thus, Applicant submit that claims 3-18, 21-26, 33, 34, 40, 41, 46-53, 56-58, 61, 62, 65-72, and 75-79 are patentably distinguishable over the cited art.

Conclusion

On the basis of the above amendments, consideration of this application and the early allowance of all claims herein are requested.

Should the Examiner wish to discuss the above amendments and remarks, or if the Examiner believes that for any reason direct contact with Applicants' representative would help to advance the prosecution of this case to finality, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,
John Barrus, Stephen Savitzky, and
Kurt Wesley Piersol

Dated: June 21, 2007

By: /Greg T. Sucoka/
Greg T. Sucoka, Esq.
Registration No. 33,800
Fenwick & West LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Phone: (650) 335-7194
Fax: (650) 938-5200